

The Gospel Messenger,

AND

SOUTHERN EPISCOPAL REGISTER.

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1829.

NO. 64.

BISHOP BOWEN'S ADDRESS,

Delivered to the Convention of the Diocese of South-Carolina, on Wednesday the 18th of February, 1828.

Brethren of the Clergy and Laity:—In the execution, in such manner as circumstances permit, of the duty belonging to the relation which I sustain to your Churches, I have visited in the course of the year, intervening between the last Convention and the present, St. Paul's Parish, Stono; St. James', Goose-creek; St. Stephen's Parish Church; the Chapel at the Rocks, in Upper St. John's Parish; St. Marks' Church, Williamsburg; St. Thomas' Parish; Grace Church, Sullivan's Island; the Congregation served in Summerville by the Rev. Mr. P. Gadsden; that in M'Phersonville, served by the Rev. Mr. Young; Walterborough Chapel, St. Bartholomew's; St. Luke's Church; St. Paul's, Pendleton; Christ Church, Greenville; Claremont Church, Stateburg; and St. Marks', Clarendon. The first named of these Parishes, St. Paul's, Stono, is served by Rev. P. Gadsden, a Deacon. The Congregation of the Parish is, from various causes, greatly diminished in number. Its condition is, however, on the whole, encouraging, and under the ministry now had in it, hope may be entertained of its amelioration. St. James', Goose-creek, is without a Minister, or adequate means of supporting one. There is a glebe, which is valuable, and the income of which, it is hoped, will yet be available towards its proper object, from which it is, by urgent necessity, at present diverted, in order to the repair of the Church. This beautiful and so much admired edifice, is by disuse, much exposed to dilapidation. A member of the Vestry, residing near it, and to whom the valuable glebe land is, at present leased, is engaged and will no doubt faithfully fulfil the engagement, to put it in some repair. He will, it is believed, also, guard it, as far as possible, from injury. St. Stephen's Parish Church was found, from the same cause injured and dilapidated. It had been for many years almost entirely thrown out of use. The Minister of Pineville Chapel now holds Divine Service there monthly, and occasionally otherwise, especially at funerals. Its cemetery is interesting to many families, still residing in the Parish or near it, and it is hoped they will sacredly guard both it and the Church, from profanation. On the occasion of my visiting it, a congregation consist-

ing of several families was present, and Confirmation was administered ; it being the first time that any peculiarly Episcopal office was ever celebrated there. In the fluctuations of agricultural population, this Church has become too remote from the many to whom it belongs, to be used as a place of regular worship. The same fluctuation may bring a sufficient number of them or their descendants, near enough to it, to cause it to be wanted for the purpose to which, it so long ago was hallowed ; and it is desirable that its preservation should interest them. The Chapel at the Rocks in St. John's, is used by a numerous and very respectable congregation. The services of the Rev. Mr. Campbell are there evidently useful and efficient ; and the scene of worship which I witnessed at this Chapel, was in a high degree, interesting. It is painfully to be regretted, that any circumstances should make the relation of that congregation to this body, as of the other two with which it is associated, so imperfect as it still continues. Either individually or officially, I have found, for a series of years, the recognition and welcome of the Brethren of the household of our faith, scarcely any where more cordial, or appropriately kind, than among the members of these congregations. At St. Marks' Church, Williamsburg, a considerable congregation met me, although the service was appointed to be held on a week day, and the Communion was administered to some humbly pious people. The Rev. Mr. Campbell occasionally visits this destitute congregation. They are not able, they say, to support a Minister. At St. Thomas' Parish, Divine Service was held at the Chapel ; for the repair of which, arrangements had been made, which, entrusted to A. Huger, Esq. will no doubt, be faithfully and satisfactorily executed. The Rev. Mr. Rutledge, the Rector of this Parish, by a happier provision than had been made for the discharge of the duties of the Beresford Bounty School, is now released from their obligation, in a sufficient degree to admit of his giving his attention in a manner more satisfactory to himself, to those which appertain peculiarly to the pastoral office.

Having left my Parish in the autumn, with a view to visit the remoter stations of our Church in the Diocese, my way was made to lie through the pine land villages at which there are congregations. At Summerville, in St. George's Dorchester, I held Divine Service with the Rev. Mr. Gadsden, in a building belonging to the Congregationalists in that Parish, the use of which, as they had no Minister, was kindly given to his congregation, as being a large proportion of the population of the village. The condition of this building, however, together with other obvious considerations, perfectly evinced to me the need there is, of an effort on the part of the Protestant Episcopalians, to provide themselves with a Church of their own—and the certain utility, with which, a successful effort to that effect, would be attended. At Walterborough, where such a Chapel was consecrated two years ago, the most gratifying evidence was before me, of the benefit derived from the enterprise, both to our Church and the community. At M'Phersonville, where the congregation of Sheldon Church were served, during the summer, by the Rev. Mr. Young, there was apparent also, the same necessity, that the inhabitants, who are members of our communion, should erect

for themselves a place of worship—and the certainty of the good which would follow. The Ministry of our Church in the country, is obviously of much greater efficiency, when and where the people are gathered into villages, and every facility and help should be afforded, by those interested in it according to their ability, to make it of more, than, where we are without Churches, it can reasonably be expected that it will be. At Pendleton, the Church, some few years since erected, has undergone some advantageous alteration, as well as ornamental improvement.—The congregation assembling in it, during the summer, is large, and there is reason to believe, that here the combined operations of the Trustees of the Society for the advancement of Christianity, of the Minister employed, and a few individual members of our communion, residing in and near the village, have been blessed, to happy, and permanently important results. At Greenville Court-house village, the substantial and commodious Church which had been erected within the last two years, although not yet entirely completed, was consecrated on the occasion of my visiting it; and arrangements were made for procuring an Act of Assembly to incorporate the Vestry and Wardens. This station of missionary service, instituted by the Society for the advancement of Christianity, has wanted the advantage of a settled resident Minister; and exhibits, therefore, as yet, a much less prosperous appearance, than that at Pendleton. Efforts to obtain for it this advantage, hitherto unsuccessful, are not relaxed. The services of the Rev. Mr. Taylor, at this station, during the last summer, when he was, as usual, disengaged from the duties of his own Parish, very essentially promoted its interest. It needs, however, in aid of the gentleman* who has most zealously cherished it, the more kindly patronage of the members of our communion, who visit or reside in the village during the summer. Such patronage, I will presume, even thus publicly to solicit for it.† At Claremont, the condition of our Church is affected, as you all must be aware, by the death of the inestimable Judge Waties, very materially; yet, you will join me in the fervent wish and prayer, that the example of the pious solicitude of that lamented man, for the house of God and the prosperity and efficacy of its offices, may not be forgotten, or be permitted to be without the influence, to which the purity of its excellence so eminently entitles it. His survivors will not endure the thought, that, because the measures for its prosecution and support, can no more be conducted under his auspices, therefore the work of God among them, involving the moral happiness and welfare of themselves and their children, shall be abandoned. There are among them, I am glad to know, pious and liberal friends of the Gospel's cause in the Church of which they are members, and we may look with sanguine hope to their perseverance, even under the discouragement of the change of circumstances, which it has pleased God in his wise Providence, that their Church should experience.‡ The Rev. Mr. Converse is

* E. Croft, Esq.

† In the death of ——— Le Bruce, Esq. the Church at Greenville sustained a loss not yet repaired.

‡ Within two years, this Church has lost by removals and death, five of the principal contributors to its support, viz: Cleland Kinloch, Dr. Brownfield, Francis Kinloch and Judge Waties, by death, and F. Huger, Esq. by removal.

Rector of the Church ; and the people are sensible of the value to them of his amiable, instructive, and very faithful and assiduous Ministry. In St. Marks, Clarendon, I had the inexpressible satisfaction of finding, since I last had visited the Parish, a new and very neat Chapel erected at the summer residence of several of the families of the congregation, at the sole expense of a pious individual, to whom, on other accounts, the Parish has been before, for very important services, much indebted. It was not so far finished as to be fit for consecration : but this and every thing proper preparatory to its use, as a place of worship, will, it is hoped, be done in the course of the ensuing spring.

Confirmation was administered at the following, of the places, mentioned, as visited within the year: viz. St. Stephen's Church, Santee ; the Rocks Chapel ; Walterborough ; M'Phersonville ; St. Luke's Church ; St. Paul's, Pendleton ; Claremont ; and St. Marks', Clarendon. It has been administered also, at St. Stephen's Chapel and St. Michael's Church, in this city. The whole number of persons confirmed is 152.

The only ordination held within the year, is that of Mr. Alexander W. Marshall, who was admitted to Deacon's orders in this Church, on the 15th of October last. Mr. Marshall has, since his ordination, been employed as a Missionary of the Society for the advancement of Christianity, at Cheraw ; the Church at that place, having become vacant in July last, by the removal of the Rev. Mr. Elliott into N. Carolina. I have no other instances of change to report to you, as to the manner in which the Churches of the Diocese are served, since we last assembled, except the following. The Rev. Mr. Young was appointed, in the spring, to St. Luke's Parish, and to officiate also at Prince Williams. The Rev. W. Wilson has been appointed by the Vestry of St. Matthews, to officiate as Minister of that Parish ; and the Rev. Mr. Fowler, (although under very discouraging circumstances) now serves that of Christ Church. The Rev. Dr. Adams, since the last Convention, has returned into the State and resumed the principalship of Charleston College. You all are aware of the value of the acquisition.

Candidates for orders, received since the last Convention, are only 2; viz. Mr. Charles M. B. Rley, and Mr. Daniel Cobia. The number now belonging to the Diocese, is 6.

Of our Diocesan Charities, I mean such as have been instituted by the Churches in Convention, it is proper to state to you the present condition and prospects. The fund established by you in aid of the General Seminary, with a view particularly to the debt yet unprovided for, which was left by the erection of the buildings of the Seminary, has not met with the patronage to which you unanimously voted it to be entitled.—The pressure of the times, in general, rather a customary, than a just explanation of the difficulty of executing purposes of this sort, is now comparatively admissible. The amount, however, which it was proposed to raise as the quota of the Diocese, is small—\$1,650: and the difficulty is rather that of getting persons to collect it, than of getting the money itself. The Standing Committee have not been unmindful of their trust in this particular, and will continue to give it, we may confidently believe, its due attention. It is melancholy, however, to reflect, that should the quota of this Diocese be paid, almost nothing will yet have been done

towards the accomplishment of the object in view ; for our Brethren in other, and far more wealthy Dioceses, do not seem likely to take their proportion of its burden. The injury sustained by the Institution in consequence of the diversion rendered necessary by this debt, of monies appropriated to the support of the Professors, may be serious ; and some plan should be devised to supply the deficiency of means, available to this last important appropriation. Perhaps a Sermon and Collection in each Church of the Diocese, for this special purpose, for a limited number of consecutive years, may, with propriety, be *recommended* by this Convention. We have the benefits of the Institution before us as matter no longer of speculation ; and the members of the Church will not be indifferent to its continued and increasing prosperity.

Of the state of the fund of the Scholarship, proposed to be annexed to the Seminary, under the name of the present Bishop of the Diocese, a Report will be laid before you. The difficulty under which it labours, may admit of the same explanation as that of other operations of the kind, at present on foot. It may be some inducement to hope that it will, ere long, be completed, to advert to the very gratifying fact, that the income of the Bishop Dehon Scholarship, has materially helped to add one very estimable and promising clergyman professionally educated at the Seminary, to the number of the Clergy of the Diocese.

Of the state of the fund instituted by the Convention for the support of the Episcopate, a Report will, as usual, be laid before you by the Treasurer of the Protestant Episcopal Society for the advancement of Christianity. The Trustees of that Society, having, from the beginning, by the desire of the Convention, accepted and executed the trust of that fund.

The most important charity amongst us, in your estimation, next to those, which, for the good of the Church, *you have set on foot*, I may presume to be, that of the Protestant Episcopal Society for the advancement of Christianity in South-Carolina, instituted in 1810, *by individual members of the Church in the Diocese*. Its usefulness is too manifest to be unknown to any of you : and you will join me in regretting, well as it has been patronised, that its claims are not more extensively felt, and that it should want the help, which it is in the power of any member of the Church, to give it. The Report of its annual proceedings is not yet published. It will probably be ready before the adjournment of the Convention, and is commended to the attention of all its members.

The Treasurer will lay on the table, for the inspection of those concerned, the statement of the several funds, committed by Vestries to the Trustees of the Society.

The proposed alterations of the Rubric of our Book of Common Prayer, will be acted upon by the General Convention, to be held in the summer of the present year. There is great evidence of sentiment adverse to their adoption. The sentiment most prevalent among you, also, is understood to be, not only unfriendly to *them*, but to any change at all in our venerable formulary of worship. As I have sought no discussion of it, in my intercourse with you, so I am prepared to acquiesce, as becomes me, in its prevalence. It is, nevertheless, proper for me to say to you, that, *individually*, I entertain the same opinion in relation to

these proposed alterations, which I last year expressed. I see not in them any alarming project for injuriously altering or mutilating *the Liturgy*. *Discretion to read or omit*, certain particulars, is already given by the Rubric, and the propositions in question, contemplate nothing more, than the extension of it to others. I am persuaded of the expediency of giving this discretion to the Clergy by act of Convention, rather than of *authorizing*, as the rejection of these propositions will be assumed to do, the various and capricious *unlicensed* discretion which now is used, on the ground of the *necessity of making the service shorter*. The danger from the adoption of the alterations, of opening a door of innovation, at which various idle schemes of fancied improvement will be crowded, it does not seem to me necessary to dread. *Both Houses of the General Convention* will never warrant any thing of the kind, but at the demand of such *abundantly experienced necessity*, as has suggested on the part of one of the Houses, what now stands *proposed* to be done.

I will detain you but to fulfil what has become impressed upon me as an indispensable duty of the relation which I hold to you. You will recognize, at least, its consistency with the principles of that relation, if not the profitableness or utility of my acting under its impression, even so far as to notice, in this place, the subject to which it refers. The honourable, happy, and healthy state of our institutions are a paramount consideration; and in following it, according to the honest conviction of my judgment, I shall not fear that I shall incur the disapprobation of any. Some venerable, highly respectable, and faithful friends of the Church among you, I know are not prepared to assent to the opinions I shall express. In the spirit of affectionate respect towards them, and with a distinct impression on my mind of the value of the services, which the Church has variously received from them, I nevertheless, submit the following; not as matter of discussion here; but as counsel, which on calm and thorough consideration may *hereafter* come to be sufficiently approved, to admit of the adoption of correspondent measures, without any interruption of harmony and affection. Indeed, I sincerely hope, that no motion in favour of the subject, will even at any future time be made, until there shall be found a disposition among the members of our Churches if not unanimous, at least nearly so, to approve and adopt it. Such unanimity, will, I think, in time, be the result of that full consideration of the subject, which it is my wish by the mention of it, to induce, among the pious and intelligent members, generally, of our communion.

Although many of you are, yet many more, are not, I believe, aware, that there practically exists, a material difference between the relation which the Clergy of our Church, in this Diocese, hold to the Churches in which they pastorally minister, considered in the light of legally created corporations, and that which in this respect, is *almost everywhere else* sustained by them. Until the Revolution, which separated our Church from the State, the acts of Assembly had provided, that the Rector, in each Parish, should be one of the Vestry. In the acts of incorporation, which were obtained after the peace of 1783, there is no express provision to such an

effect. What experience led to the sense of the expediency of such a change as that which thus practically has ensued, is not known; nor can there I believe, be any reason assigned for it, but the feeling which unavoidably associated the investment of the Clergy as such, with any chartered privilege whatever, with the hateful idea of hierarchy. Where our Church had been provincially hierarchical, as it had, in this and other of the Southern States, this feeling naturally obtained, in a degree, in which it could not elsewhere have existence. It was sustained by the recent memory of the wrongs and injuries, and even outrages of the parent government, composed of Church and State allied, or at least, such as it had intrusted with its interest, as weakly as wantonly inflicted; and found a warm and active sympathy in the transmitted sense of the early discountenance and unkindness from the Provincial Establishment (the result rather of national than sectarian prejudices) with which the descendants of the first Huguenot emigrants, who numerous and respectable, were now piously and, in general, affectionately incorporated with it, had cherished the story of their fathers. To those who are accustomed to contemplate in the history of events, whether of civil or religious history, that mingling up of circumstances, by which, the character, as well of communities, as of individuals, is often, for successive generations modified, there will seem no difficulty in accounting, mainly thus, for the peculiarity of feeling which has distinguished the members of our communion, in this, from those of other portions of our Church, in the United States. The jealousy of Ecclesiastical power, whether exercised by Clergymen or Laymen, was the principle which became predominant in their conduct of business relating to religion. Of the Ecclesiastical power of the parent government, since the abolition of all provincial rule, the Clergy of the Church, which it had established here, could be the only representative; and shadowy as was the representation of any such power in them, brought to a state of absolute dependence upon the will of the people, for their employment and its wages, yet there was always manifest the operation of this principle, in a vigilance and impatience of all assertion of prerogative on their part, which it required the utmost circumspection and caution to avoid awakening into displeasure and offence. No want of kindness was permitted to mingle itself with the operation of this sensibility to the claims of privilege, so long as individually or collectively, the Clergy either prudently abstained from their assertion, or made the assertion of them, in a manner, becoming, either their office, or the proprieties and charities of society. On the other hand, it may be asserted that even under the peculiar circumstances, by which, their character as Churchmen had become marked, the members of our communion generally, have retained a temper of personal friendliness and benevolence towards the Clergy, as strongly marked as a similar temper can be found to be, in any other portion of the Church. I speak, from a heart not insensible to the obligation of gratitude, my own uniform experience, for full twenty years, in bearing a testimony such as this; and know the frequent experience of my brethren to be such as to justify the sentiment I express. But co-existent

with this temper of kindness and affection, on the part of the Laity of our communion, has, for the most part, since the Revolution, appeared a singular unwillingness to trust them, in some respects, with that, which, elsewhere, is regarded as at least the harmless prerogative of office. I say, for the most part, since the Revolution; for within a few years, it has been manifest, that the error of sentiment to which I have referred, has been much corrected; and there needs, I persuade myself only due reflection and adequate information, in a community, in other respects, so generous and liberal as ours, to put its reproach entirely away from among us. I shall have said its *reproach*, I trust, inoffensively, when I have explained myself as referring to the difficulty with which it has, sometimes, in other portions of the Church, seemed capable of belief, that the peculiarity on which I have remarked, should, in so great a degree, exist among us, operating in the manner in which we have seen it. The ameliorated state of sentiment, that has now, to a considerable extent obtained, justifies me in the confidence with which I persuade myself, that I can give no offence to any of you, in expressing before you here the decided conviction of my mind, that the continued and increasing welfare and respectability of our institutions, as the Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina, requires that usages, which, every where else are deemed essential to the official respectability and comfort of our Clergy, should not be considered so utterly inadmissible as they have been; and especially that the prosperity and sound safety of the Church, will be seen, on mature consideration to require, that your Clergy hold other relation to the corporation, in each instance, of the Churches which they serve, than they have for many years, been permitted to.—There is nothing in the history of the Church as it was in this portion of it, before the Revolution, which will justify the apprehension of injury to the temporal or spiritual interests of their brethren, from their being placed here, I care not to say on the same footing with their brethren elsewhere, but on a footing at least, less unlike it.—Nor is there in its history, since that period, any thing that can be adduced to show, that clerical influence, can thus be made injurious. If any instance of evil, from such a source can be adduced, it must be a solitary instance, and not admissible as good ground of general rule. Designs, were it possible for the Clergy to entertain them, against the temporal interest of their Churches, in favour of their own, were at least as capable of execution without the privilege to which I refer, as with it. But neither can the *suspicion* of such designs be possibly entertained by any mind, nor can the undue or injurious interference, on the part of Ministers, in the temporal business of Churches, be supposed, without the accompanying supposition of deficient attention and fidelity, where Lay responsibility duly executed, might at once arrest and expose it. In all those portions of the Church, (which are all but our own,* with scarcely

* In Virginia, Churches are not incorporated, but Ministers meet and deliberate it is believed (at least when there is business which makes proper subject of opinion for them) with their selected Lay officers. In the one or two Churches in Georgia, it is not known what regulation exists.

another exception,) where the circumstance of order to which I am referring, obtains, and always has obtained, all experience is in its favour. Not an instance of evil arising from it, either as to the interest or the peace of the Church, can I believe be adduced. Both, on the contrary, are thought, and experience justifies the opinion, to be secured by it. It were easy to show how naturally the circumstance, must as a general rule rather operate thus, than otherwise: that while, if no better motive than his own welfare prompted it, the attention of the most esteemed Minister, might be expected to be rather usefully, than troublesomely given, to the manner in which the temporal business of his Church was conducted; in general no Minister could usefully or worthily, or should therefore be permitted at all, to exercise, his office, who should have a persevering proneness to intermeddle in the proper business of Lay officers; and that the peace of Churches might be preserved from interruption by the freedom and confidence, with which, all their affairs were made the subject of deliberation together, between their Ministers, and selected members of them, acting in behalf of the rest. As one body, Minister and Vestry might be expected to act in harmony; and when, through the continued fault of the former, they should not, the adequate remedy of the evil under the circumstances of the Church in America, would be found in the hands of the latter. As distinct parties, acting without mutual consultation, or any comparison of opinions or feelings, and only one of them independent of the pleasure of the other, may there not be danger of jealousy, misapprehension, discord, which may extend itself among the people and occasion scandal and confusion? May not the Minister be led, injuriously to his own, and the peace of his people, to be suspicious of the invasion of his rights of pastoral office, (I mean, of course, inherent, prescriptive, and not chartered rights) and may not the other party, be more liable than under other circumstances, through want of free official interchange of opinions with the Minister, to the danger of encroaching on such rights, in errors, which however painfully they may affect *him*, and however obviously they may infringe upon principles of order generally recognized as important, it may be difficult to arrest, short of the point, at which *Christ shall have been deeply wounded in the house of his friends?*

Brethren, I have extended these remarks further than your time, perhaps should have seemed to me to warrant. I will close them with the repetition of the wish that I may not be thought in them, to be giving occasion for unseasonable discussion of irreconcilable differences of opinion. My object, as I have stated, is to cause the subject to be considered and understood in its real merits; to induce a calm, candid, friendly inquiry into it elsewhere, and not the discussion of it here. It may hereafter, perhaps, be viewed alike by most, if not by all. At present, and until it is so viewed, the Clergy are willing, I trust, (although I have spoken my own sentiments in what I have offered, without reference to them for theirs) patiently to bear the humiliating difference, which exists between their case, and that of

their brethren elsewhere—and for which, there exists not, I sincerely believe, any reason in their character or conduct. For prerogative I would not contend for them, nor advise nor encourage them to contend with their brethren. Firm to assert that which pertains to sound and wholesome order, it is at the same time, their indispensable, bounden duty, to be ready to forego any privilege, which it may involve to them, rather than “themselves offend, or be occasion that others offend.” Neither have I introduced this subject thus, until I have learned that some at least of my brethren of the Laity, with whom I had not conversed with a view to such a result, viewed it, as I do. I have introduced it, under a sense of all the solemn responsibility, in which, I am bound to study the peace and welfare of the Churches, over which, I am placed; and in the awful uncertainty of life, of which none of us can be unmindful, I have felt, that what had become impressed upon me as my duty in this particular, should not be deferred. I have meant to convey in it no more than becoming pastoral counsel. It is given in the spirit of affection, and will be received I am persuaded, with a candid estimation of its motive. I have no *personal, individual* solicitude whatever, as to its object.

Yet far more urgently, I confess, do I feel on every recurring occasion of this kind, under the same solemn consideration of the precariousness of all human opportunities of action, the obligation that is upon me to offer to my Brethren of the Clergy, (not unmindful that in every duty of their calling, I am partaker with them,) the exhortation that they labour with diligence to *fulfil the Ministry which they have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God*. In some circumstances this may seem not to admit of being done with as much satisfaction or efficiency as in others. But no circumstances can forbid us to be faithful to the vow that is upon us, “to give all diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord commanded, and as this Church hath received the same.”*

My Brethren of the Laity will permit me, finally, to entreat that they will contribute all they can, of their influence and example, in aid of the Ministry, to accomplish its great moral result in winning the souls of men to God, for their present and everlasting happiness. Small as is the number of those in whom we recognize the willing active friends of Christ and of the Church, cheerfully giving of their time and care to its concerns, yet they will not want animating considerations for *perseverance without weariness in their well doing*, so long as the cheering testimony of their own hearts assures them that that to which they have put their hand, is that *work and labour of love which shall in no wise lose its reward*.

NATHANIEL BOWEN.

* Ordination of Priests.

FOR THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

NO. 3.

ROMAN CATHOLIC WORSHIP OF THE CRUCIFIX,

And the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist; and Transubstantiation.

Roman Catholics complain that Protestants say that they "worship the Crucifix or figure of Christ upon the cross; which is idolatrous; that they adore and pray to the Cross; which of all the corruptions of the Roman Catholic worship, is the most gross and intolerable; that they worship the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, and by such worship are betrayed into the grossest idolatry."*

Here, both in the assertion of what they consider facts, and in the expression of opinions founded on those facts, Protestants are charged with doing injustice to the religion of Roman Catholics.—The facts are "that Roman Catholics worship the Crucifix or figure of Christ, upon the Cross; adoring and praying to the Cross—and that they worship Bread and Wine in the Eucharist." The opinions founded on those facts are, that the *worship* of the Crucifix or figure of Christ upon the Cross, as used by Roman Catholics, is "*idolatrous*"—and their adoration and prayer addressed to the Cross, is "*of all the corruptions of the Roman Catholic worship, the most gross and intolerable;*" and that "*by the worship of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, Roman Catholics are betrayed into the grossest idolatry.*"

Let us first dispose of the matter of fact, in relation to which, Protestants are said so shockingly to misrepresent the religion of Roman Catholics—Almain, a scholastic divine, and professor of divinity of great celebrity, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, is quoted by Bishop Taylor and others, as saying—"Eundem honorem deberi imagini et exemplari: ac proinde imagines S. Trinitatis, Christi, et Crucis, cultu Latria adorandas esse." *The images of the Trinity, of Christ, and of the Cross, are to be adored with divine worship.* And to the same purpose, is the following from the Pontifical published by the authority of Clement the VIIIth. "Crux legati quia debetur ei Latria, erit a Dextris." *The Legate's Cross must be on the right hand, because Latria or divine honour is due to it.* And Aquinas says, "that in which we place the hope of our salvation, to that we exhibit the worship of *Latria*, or divine worship: but in the Cross we place the hope of our salvation, for so the Church says—

O Crux, ave, spes Unica,
Hoc passionis tempore:
Auge piis justitiam,
Reisque dona veniam."

* Items taken as before, in the order in which they are found.

These authorities may in some measure make it appear, that, of course, the Crucifix must be worshipped by Roman Catholics. But do their offices of worship show any such fact? The Roman Missal, at the form of solemn service appointed for Good Friday, has the following rubric: *Postea, Sacerdos solus portat crucem ad Locum ante altare præparatum, et genuflexus ibidem eam locat: mox depositis calceamentis, accedit ad adorandum crucem, ter genua flectens, antequam eam deosculetur. Hoc facto revertitur, et accipit calceamenta, et casulam. Postmodum ministri altaris, deinde alii Clerici et Laici, bini et bini, ter genibus flexis, ut dictum est, Crucem adorant.*" Of this Rubric I do not find any exact translation in the American English version of the Missal to which I have referred in a previous number. There is, however, the following: "The Priest takes down the Cross, and uncovering the top of it, says, *Ant.* Behold the wood of the Cross, on which hung the salvation of the world.

"Then the Clergy, and all the people on their bended knees, answer:

"*R.* Come let us venerate.* *Venite adoremus.*

"*This Ant. and R.* being repeated twice more, till the whole Cross is uncovered, the Priest lays it down in a proper place, and all kneeling thrice on both knees, reverently approach to, and devoutly kiss the feet of the Crucifix." Missal, pp. 228—9. Again, p. 231, we find an Anthem beginning thus: "We adore thy Cross, O Lord," &c. and then, a Hymn in English, thus:

"O faithful Cross—O noblest Tree,
In all our woods there's none like thee," &c.

In the Laity's Directory also, p. 53, we find the following expression, amidst instructions relating to the celebration of Good Friday—"And after the *adoration of the Cross*, that is to say, of Jesus crucified," &c. Thus, then, it is plain that adoration is given to the Crucifix—as implying (Roman Catholics say,) the adoration of Jesus crucified, present to the mind of the worshipper;—language of adoration being, however, directly addressed to the image itself.—In reference to this, the opinion which Protestants have been found to express, is, that it is *idolatrous*. It is painful to entertain such an opinion, and Protestants, it is presumed, entertain it with the persuasion, that while the error of idolatry cannot but in point of fact attach to the scene which in this feature of it, the worship of still so numerous a part of the *Holy Catholic Church*, constitutes, there are very many, who even when on their knees they *adore the Crucifix*, are in their hearts, rendering their homage to Christ, at the same time that

* "The intention of the Church in exposing the Cross to our veneration on this day, is, that we might the more effectually raise up our hearts to him, who expired thereon for our redemption. Whenever, therefore, we kneel or prostrate ourselves, before a Crucifix, it is Jesus Christ whom we adore, and in whom alone our respects terminate." This note seems to have been suggested by the obvious apprehension, that the people thus called upon to *venerate*, would naturally understand the call, to mean, *come let us worship*.

they bow themselves down to the stock of a tree. It cannot reasonably offend Roman Catholics, however, if Protestants still cannot but believe that *they worship and pray to the Crucifix or figure of Christ upon the Cross; and that such worship and prayer are idolatrous.*"—As to the opinion that this worship of the Crucifix, is of all the corruptions of the Roman Catholic worship the most gross and abominable, by some, it may honestly, although erroneously be held—and it is scarcely worth disputing. The amount of the matter is no more than this: Some Protestants innocently and perhaps ignorantly think some particulars of the worship of Roman Catholics, more inconsistent with Scripture, primitive Christianity and reason, than others. I sincerely wish I could think that *none* of them were *at all* so.

The next item of complaint against Protestants to be noticed, is that they have said, "that Roman Catholics, worship Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, and by such worship are betrayed into the grossest idolatry." That Roman Catholics do worship the consecrated elements in the celebration of the Eucharist, is not by them denied.* But it is denied that *they worship Bread and Wine*, the Bread and Wine having given place by the transubstantiating effect of the consecration of them by the Priest, to the real body and blood of Christ. Here, then, Protestants do *misrepresent* Roman Catholics, if *they* (Roman Catholics) can show that the Bread and Wine, or, what to the senses are so, are not Bread and Wine—but as they assert the *body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ*. This they say they do show—if not to the eye of sense and reason, yet to the eye of faith. If, however, Protestants find it impossible to be convinced, that the sacramental Bread and Wine, even after the consecration by the Priest, are any thing else than Bread and Wine, Roman Catholics must admit, that they do not *wilfully misrepresent* them in saying that they worship Bread and Wine in the Eucharist. *They see them do so.* It is a matter determined by the *sense of seeing*. They see the Bread and Wine and they see the adoration or worship paid to them. But under the appearance of Bread and Wine are the body and blood of Christ, says the Church; that is as some of her members explain her sense to be, the supernatural and immortal body, of which we can assert nothing but what the Scripture and the Church may be found to authorize. Now of the presence of the spiritualized and supernatural body of Christ in this Sacrament, we know nothing by inspired information. There was a dispute we know on the question, in the beginning of the 13th century, whether, in the Eucharist, the body of Christ was received incorruptible, as it was after his resurrection, or corruptible as it was before. "It is to be supposed (says Jortin) that the incorruptibles got the better."† And we may suppose those to be of some such party in the Church, who tell us about the *supernatural* body of Christ as

* The circumstances of Roman Catholic worship of the Host, and the various solemn ceremonies connected with it, it is deemed unnecessary to state.

† Remarks on Ecclesiastical History.

that which takes the place of the Bread, and quote St. Paul in the 15th chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, to make good what they mean. Of such a body of Christ we know little from the Scriptures. Of the body in which he suffered we know him to have met his disciples at the passover, and in the same body we know him to have appeared to his disciples afterwards, and to have ascended from them visibly into heaven. "*Handle me, and see,*" said he to them, "*that it is I myself, for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.*" If it is the supernatural body, as changed by the final reception to glory which is in the Bread and Wine—then the question occurs, how can this idea accord with the article of the Creed of Pius IVth, which says, "in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, *really* and *substantially*, the *body and blood*, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ;" St. Paul having said, of the *spiritual* body, what is probably considered applicable to that of Christ in glory—*flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God*.—So of the body which *then was*, Christ spoke when he said, *this is my body—or, let this represent to you my body, as it shall be soon seen broken on the Cross*. "If we suppose, (says Archbishop Synge) his meaning *to be*, that this Bread and Wine, which he blessed and distributed among his disciples, were the figure, representation, and pledge of his body crucified, and his blood shed for us; this interpretation is easy and natural, conformable to the common way of speaking among the Jews, and indeed amongst all men; and exactly agreeably to the command which he thereupon gives, that we should do this in remembrance of him. But if we take his words in the same sense, that the Roman Catholic Church does, that what he gave to his disciples, was *truly, really, and substantially* his *body and blood*, such a train of absurdities will follow, as can hardly be reckoned up."—(*Charitable Address, &c.* chap. 23.) Roman Catholics say that this interpretation will not answer, and that Christ meant his disciples to believe, that the Bread which he had in his hand was his body *literally*—for it was so *then* as well as *now*, if the words admit *now* of no other than the literal interpretation—that is, Christ required his disciples to believe against the testimony of their senses, that the Bread in his hand was not Bread. Now did he, we may ask, on any other occasion, require them to believe him against the evidence of their senses? When he says I am the door, I am the good shepherd, I am the vine, &c. did he require them to believe him to be actually a door, or a shepherd, or a vine?† And did he not, on the other hand, continually require them to judge by the evidence

† Some things are spoken of Christ *literally*, others *figuratively*. Thus, when he is called Bread, a Lamb, or a Lion, the language is emblematical, for he is no one of these things. Upon this principle the Eucharistic elements are naturally corruptible Bread and corruptible Wine, but God might render them spiritually though not naturally, the body and blood of Christ. See Elfric's Pastoral Homily, as preserved in Foxe and in Collier's Ecclesiastical History. It was late in the 10th century that such sentiments were uttered in the high places of the Church. Elfric gives the sense of the Church in England, as it then was. It differs considerably from Roman Catholic Transubstantiation.

of their own senses, as to the works he wrought and the miraculous interposition of heaven otherwise, whether he were not the Messiah, the Son of God.

The evidence of Scripture, however, is by learned and candid Roman Catholics* themselves, admitted insufficient for the faith which the doctrine of Transubstantiation implies, if the Church does not make this literal interpretation the true one; and the only one to be received. I really see not how the interpretation of the Church, can make the matter plainer. To the Church we reverently submit our judgment, as to that on which it is its province to decide, and of which it is more competent to judge than we are. But the Church is not better authority than my own ears, for what I hear, or than my own eyes, for what I see; therefore the Bread is still Bread to my senses, when the Church has decreed that the words of Christ mean that it is not. But can it be shown that from the Apostles' time, the literal was the received and authorized sense of our Saviour's words, this is my body—this is my blood? It is *confidently asserted that it cannot*. Protestant writers have again and again abundantly shown from the writings of the early fathers, that they held the doctrine of the Eucharist without that of the real bodily presence;† and it may be seen as matter of variously attested historical fact, that it was not until the close of the 8th century, that the real bodily presence of Christ was asserted—nor until the 12th that the manner of the change in the Eucharist was accounted an article of faith: when Innocent III. in the Council of Lateran, established Transubstantiation, both as to the doctrine, and the word.‡

Returning, then, to the complaint against Protestants, I see not now how they can be censured, either for saying that Roman Catholics worship Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, or for entertaining the opinion that in *such worship they are betrayed into idolatry*. That Latria is due to the consecrated elements, is the established faith of the Roman Catholic Church. According to the decree passed on this subject, in the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent, Latria or divine worship is not denied to be rendered to them. Unless, then, those elements can be made to appear to Protestants, *Christ himself*, “*truly, really, and substantially, body and blood, soul and divinity*”§—and not mere Bread and Wine, as they see them to be, how can it appear to them, to be any thing less than *gross idolatry*, to render them such worship? It has been affected to show, that the transubstantiation of Bread and Wine, into the body and blood

* Bellarm. de Sac. Euch. lib. 3. c. 23.

† See particularly Tillotson's Sermon on Transubstantion, and Stillingsfleet's rational account of the grounds of Protestant Religion; and Bishop White's able and learned Dissertation on Transubstantiation, annexed to his Lectures on the Catechism.

‡ See in addition to the various authors generally familiar, an Historical account of Transubstantiation, in the third volume of Soames excellent History of the Reformation. The very learned Dr. Wharton also has conclusively and unanswerably shown that this doctrine was not the established faith of the Church of Rome until the 12th century. *Reply to Archbishop Carroll*, pp. 44. and seq.

§ Creed of Pius IVth.

of Christ, may be believed on the same principle as that on which we rest our faith in the Holy Trinity and other mysterious doctrines of Christianity. The answer is obvious. These doctrines relate to the invisible and incomprehensible nature of operations of Deity. *No man hath seen God at any time, and as the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth—so is every one that is born of the spirit.* The Eucharistic elements are matter of sensible observation and act.—We know them not to be God, because we see that they are Bread and Wine, and “if we cannot be certain of what we see, (says Tillotson,) we can be certain of nothing.”

Much paper might be filled with the evidence and argument by which Protestants justify themselves in rejecting the doctrine of Transubstantiation—as much has been by Roman Catholics to show that they ought not to consider Roman Catholics *betrayed by it into idolatry*—but I cannot conceive it to be necessary, and will trouble you with nothing further on the subject.

Roman Catholics in repelling the imputation of error in their sentiments and conduct, in relation to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, have thought it not amiss to reproach the Protestant Episcopalians of England and America, with using in their Liturgy respecting the same Sacrament, language which is “*unintelligible.*” As my object is not so much to show that Protestants are faultlessly right in their doctrines and phrases, as that they are not so shockingly wrong as they have been said to be in their representation of the religion of Roman Catholics, I shall leave the very sufficient answer which this reproach admits, to any to whom it may appear necessary to give it. Bossuet himself may be found on examination to admit that the term *spiritually* applied to the Eucharistic eating and drinking, is not absolutely to be rejected.

A PROTESTANT CATHOLIC.

The Plea of the Government, for profaning the Lord's Day, considered; or, Notes on the Report of the Committee of the Senate, on the subject of conveying the Mails on the Lord's Day.

“This principle,” (viz. of setting apart Sunday as a day of respite from the ordinary vocations of life,) “the Committee would not wish to disturb.” And yet the Committee are decidedly in favour of the Mail travelling not on some Sundays, but on every Sunday, a measure which necessarily involves the disturbing of the principle by thousands, which invites the millions who are remotely connected with the Mail to disturb that principle, which in fact bribes thousands, to the amount of their salaries, to disturb the principle; and as an example does more to disturb the principle than any other instance of disturbing the principle which exists in our country, or than almost any other instance which the government could sanc-

tion. It is wonderful that men of reflection could have suffered to go forth a declaration like that above quoted, that they would venture to say that they would not wish to do *that*, which they were in the very act of doing.

"The proper object of government is—not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another." The resting of the Mail on Sunday, does not determine that any man shall esteem that day above another, but it only shows that the government does reverence Sunday. If the suspension of all public business on Sunday does not determine that any citizen shall esteem that day above another, we do not see how the suspension of the Mail would determine the same question. The truism above quoted is, therefore, altogether irrelevant. Whether the government ought to show a preference for Sunday is another question, which we shall have occasion to consider hereafter. At present we will only remark, that the showing this preference in some modes at least, is approved by the Committee, for they say "the principle has received the sanction of the national legislature, so far as to admit a suspension of all public business on that day, except in cases of absolute necessity, or of great public utility. This principle the Committee would not wish to disturb." The Committee, then, are in favour of Congress showing that they esteem one day above another, but they are not in favour of showing this esteem by an act to restrain the Mail on that day. If the suspension of the Mail on Sunday would be to determine that our citizens shall esteem one day above another, then the suspension of all public business on Sunday does determine that matter. The argument is a good one, or it is not. If it is a good one, then Congress have already committed a great error. If it be a bad argument, as it respects the suspension of public business, it cannot be a good one as it respects the suspension of the Mail.

"These—would not more readily enforce it (*viz.* the observance of Sunday) than they would enforce secret prayer or devout meditations." We have here a hint, and we have many hints in this report, that it is the wish of some Christians to enforce the observance of the Lord's day. Surely this charge does not apply to the petitioners. A discerning public must perceive the manifest distinction between asking Congress not to violate the Lord's day, and asking them to enforce its observance. They ask Congress not to disturb the principle of respecting the first day of the week, by requiring their agents in the Post Office department to attend to business on that day. They do not ask them to compel these persons, or any persons, to keep the day holy. It is one thing for the government to respect an institution, and another thing to compel others to respect it. If there be no distinction, then the government by suspending all public business on that day, does enforce the observance of it. And to suspend the Mail would be doing what has been done for a long time without being objected to.

An act of Congress prohibiting all worldly business on the Lord's day, might be called an enforcing its observance, but an act pro-

hibiting the public business, that is, the business committed to its agents by Congress, is nothing more than a declaration that Congress reverences the day, and such a declaration enforces reverence for the day no otherwise than by the persuasion of a high example. The expression *enforce*, is altogether inappropriate. It would be correct to say the observance is *recommended* by the government, inasmuch as it pays outward respect to the day. Congress has, or had its meetings opened with prayer. Did they thereby *enforce* prayer on any private citizen? They do not sit on Sunday. Do they thereby enforce the observance of that day on any citizen? Let their Mail rest on Sunday, and we shall have only one more evidence of their respect for religion. The closing of their Hall, and the stopping of the Mail on Sunday, are precisely similar acts, of a refusal to profane the day, not of enforcing its observance on any one.

"Urging the fact, that neither their Lord nor his disciples ever enjoined its observance," (*viz.* the Sabbath.) If the Committee are not willing to make themselves responsible for this fact, (as they call it,) they should have been a little more guarded in their phraseology. The Saviour says that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it; a virtual declaration that the moral law (of which the ten commandments form the substance) was still binding, and it will be recollected that the observance of a seventh day for religious uses, is a material part of that law. On the occasion of his plucking ears of corn to satisfy hunger, he took great pains to prove that there was no real violation of the Sabbath in that act, which he would not have done if the institution was abrogated, for it would have been a summary way of answering the objections to say that there was no longer any law on the subject. Both he and his disciples sacredly observed holy time. By example, therefore, and at least by indirect instruction, they did enjoin what the Committee say they did not. However, knowledge of theology was not expected of them, and perhaps it would have been as well if they had not touched this part of the subject, or at least given their opinions more modestly.

"Not *coerce* others to act upon his persuasion." We have here another hint of a design to coerce the observance of the Sabbath, and must say that it is disingenuous. Prejudice alone could discover in the simple petition that the government would cease to profane the Lord's day, a wish to coerce that body, or any one person. There is a wish to persuade that body to suspend the Post Office branch of public business, as they do suspend several other branches, and further the petition did not go. We have another appeal to the peculiar sensitiveness of the American people on the subject of religious liberty, in the remarks that "the Jewish government enforced religious observances," and that the "example of other nations should admonish us to watch carefully against its early indications," *viz.* of "a system of religious coercion." This is not at all to the purpose. We are not willing to believe that it was brought in for effect. The best apology for it is its being dictated by prejudice.

"It is not the legitimate province of the Legislature to determine what religion is true, or what is false." Who said it was? Who denies a proposition almost self-evident?

Citizens "are alike entitled to protection from the government." What has the Mail resting on Sunday to do with this position?—Who would lose his governmental protection by that measure? "The transportation of the Mail on the first day of the week, it is believed, does not interfere with the rights of conscience." We have the same observation repeated further on, and suppose it does not? Was this alleged? It was alleged that it interfered with respect due to religion by every government, and by our own, in perfect consistency with its constitution, and its own unobjected to usages. Let the Committee disprove this if they can, and not divert attention to a foreign topic.

"Should Congress adopt the sentiment (viz. that the practice is a violation of the law of God,) it would establish the principle that the Legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God." The fallacy here is in the promise, Congress certainly may grant the petition without adopting the sentiments of the petitioners. They are not asked to adopt any particular sentiment, but to make an enactment which does not imply the entertaining of that sentiment, or any other sentiment than this one, that the measure is expedient. It will be in time to expatiate on the evils of Congress undertaking to decide what is the law of God when they are asked to do so, or their doing so is probable. A plain man would be at a loss to trace any connexion between the Mail resting on Sunday and the hint about persecution which the Committee have dropped. At any rate the persecution feared is one which the Post-Masters and carriers would be very glad to have inflicted on them. "It would involve a legislative decision in a religious controversy." To this we reply, 1st—That this result does not necessarily follow. There can be no controversy on a subject in which all nations concur, and the Committee tell us "that some respite is required, &c. is an established principle sanctioned by the usages of all nations, whether Christian or Pagan." But 2dly. If reference is had here to the preference of Sunday rather than Saturday, we reply the decision on the part of Congress in favour of the former day, is necessarily incidental, and therefore could give no offence, for no reasonable Jew or Sabbatarian would expect that the wishes of a small minority, rather than of the great majority, should be consulted. It may be said, Congress might pay respect to both days.—But this would be manifestly unreasonable, for it would sacrifice the principle for the sake of the detail. The principle is, that one day in seven should be set apart for rest, and to set apart two days would be an arrangement that all parties would of course object to, and in fact a violation of the original principle. No reflecting man would consider the question of the particular day of equal importance with the question of appropriating to religion a seventh part of the week. If his wishes as to the latter point were gratified, he could not reasonably object that his wishes as to the former point were not, if

he recollected that not only the majority of the persons concerned, but of the law-makers themselves, had a different preference. If I were a Jew I would, of course, prefer Saturday, but I should prefer that Congress should reverence Sunday than no day at all; that is, that they should manifest respect for the great principles of reverencing religion, and appropriating to it a seventh part of the time, principles equally dear to the Jew and the Christian. But all this reasoning might be spared, for the legislative decision in a religious controversy, and in this very controversy, which the Committee deem so alarming, has long since been made, and what is not a little remarkable, the Committee are aware of it.

By suspending public business on Sunday, and more, by appointing chaplains to officiate on that day, Congress have decided not merely that reverence is due to one day in seven, an opinion entertained by their constituents generally, but more, that a preference is due to Sunday, in which some of their countrymen cannot concur. Have any evils resulted from this religious decision by Congress? Has the Jew, or the seventh day Baptist, whispered a murmur of complaint? Perhaps they may now, since the Senate has reminded them that "this principle once introduced, it is impossible to define its bounds." What may be the effect of the suggestions of this Report we cannot say, but we are well convinced that none of the religious persons just named would have ever dreamed of objecting to the Mail resting on Sunday, on the grounds alleged by the Committee, or indeed on any grounds of a religious character. The State and City laws, it is believed, in every part of our country, recognize the sanctity of the first day of the week, and in various ways guard it from profanation, and though a murmur may be raised here and there, they are known to be generally acquiesced in as becoming and wholesome. Why should it be supposed that the application of the principle to the Post Office department would give offence? Indeed the principle is already recognized even in this department in some degree, for the offices are closed during the hours of Christian public worship, and as this is not complained of, there is no reason to believe that the resting of the Mail would be. If a legislative act of reverence for Sunday is equivalent to a declaration of what is, and what is not, the law of God, or to "a defining of the divine law," and if such a declaration be a hazardous precedent, the precedent has been long since made again and again by the National Legislature, State Legislatures, and municipal authorities, and the dangers, we are happy to add, are yet to come. We believe they have no existence but in the imagination of the Committee.—But have not the Committee in fact passed a decision in a religious controversy, by this very report? They have decided that so far as the Post Office is concerned, there shall be no Sabbath. If it would be a dangerous precedent to *decide* that there shall be a Sabbath, and that Sunday shall be the day, is it less dangerous to make the decision the contrary way, viz. that there shall be no Sabbath. A religious question was proposed and the Committee have decided it in one way. A decision was unavoidable.

"Extensive religious combinations, to effect a political object are always dangerous." Now we disarm this solemn warning at once, by remarking that the object is not political. And we have yet to learn that it is less a right and a duty in religious persons, than it would be in any other members of the community to combine their influence and eloquence for the effecting of purposes which appear to them important to themselves and their country.

"This first effort calls for the establishment of a principle which—would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizen." To what principle do the Committee allude? If to the deciding a religious controversy, we have noticed and we think refuted their assertion when it was first made, by showing that such a decision was unavoidable, that if it was wrong the error was of long standing, and that as no evils had resulted from it, none could reasonably be anticipated. How the religious rights of a Jew or Sabbatarian can be affected by Congress paying respect (as they always have,) to Sunday rather than Saturday, we do not understand. But it may be not this old principle but some new principle is in the view of the Committee. We wish they had been more specific.

"Unless it should be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority." The report tells us that "under the present regulation of the Post Office department, the rights of conscience are not invaded." We are sure we could say with equal truth, that those rights would not be invaded by requiring the Mail to stop on Sunday. The remark above quoted is not at all to the purpose, unless the petitioners asserted, which I am sure they did not, that the travelling on Sunday of the Mail was an infringement of their rights of conscience. No; they took other ground, viz. that religious belief was essential to the welfare of Society, that religious belief separated from the Sabbatical institution could not exist, as experience has fully attested, that it becomes a paternal government to protect this institution, and that even in our country, so jealous on the subject, *that* measure of negative protection which consists in the government abstaining from violating the institution, could not reasonably and would not be disapproved.

"The various departments of Government require, frequently in peace, always in war, the speediest intercourse with the remotest parts of the country. Shall we not forbid the movement of an army, prohibit an assault," &c. ? The petitioners do not ask that the Mail shall never travel on the Lord's day, but only that it shall not always do so. Cases may exist, on the principle stated by our Lord himself, viz. that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," in which a departure from the sacred rest of the day is not only justifiable but a duty. But it is a new mode of reasoning to make exceptions a ground for the establishment of a rule.

"The commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of our country—require a constant and the most expeditious correspondence." Here we have the true ground of the proceeding which the Committee are defending. It is on the mistaken idea that the

prosperity of the country depends upon this violation of the Lord's day, that it was commenced, is persevered in, and now vindicated. It is for this phantom, general prosperity, that the moral interests of the community are to be sacrificed. No Christian will admit that the prosperity of our country can be advanced by a measure contrary to the law of God. And if the position be admitted, he would reasonably maintain that worldly prosperity was purchased too dearly at the expense of the divine favour. Suppose I were to concede that the individual who laboured seven days would become rich sooner than he who laboured only six days, would it follow that the former was the wisest man? Is wealth the *summum bonum* either to an individual or a nation? But I deny the position on the highest authority. "The blessing of the Lord, it maketh rich." And how can that blessing be expected by the man or the nation who habitually transgress the law of God? But whither would the reasoning of the Report conduct us? If one violation of the Sabbath is to be persevered in, because the interests of commerce, agriculture and manufactures require it, why not another and another? Would not Congress sooner dispatch their business and save the public money, if they met seven days in the week? Would not the merchant, the farmer, the manufacturer, do more business, and sooner, because wealthy, and advance the national wealth, if they pursued their business without any intermission? The argument that more can be accomplished by constant than by intermitted labour, is equally applicable to every pursuit in which our citizens are engaged. And if one pursuit, viz. the Mail operations, are not to be intermitted because thereby business will be more expeditiously done, and wealth gained and convenience promoted, why might not all other pursuits be carried on uninterruptedly for the same reason? You permit the merchant, indeed you encourage and strongly tempt him to transact business on the Lord's day; why not permit the labourer to go to his field, and the shop-keeper to open his doors, the victualler to remain at his stall, and in fine abolish all those laws which prohibit ordinary occupations on the Lord's Day? If the argument now before us is a good one, it is of universal application. And Congress itself is inconsistent in suspending its business on one day in seven.

St. Paul considered it a slander that it was said he taught men to do evil that good may come. But the Committee would consider such a report no slander, for they defend the measure we are considering, on the ground of its "moral bearings," and its preventing much irreligion and immorality, such as extra travelling on the Lord's day, and passing that day at taverns under circumstances not friendly to devotion. It has been well observed, consequences belong to Providence. Let man follow the straight path of duty, and not doubt that divine goodness will prevent those evils effects to ourselves and others which we may blindly fear. No individual or nation has a right to do wrong, that a greater wrong which it anticipates may be averted. If, in consequence of my doing what is right, others do wrong, the responsibility rests not on

me, but on them. But if I do wrong that they may act correctly, the sin is wholly mine.

"We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for the worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian Ministers." If this consequence would follow from the government showing respect to the Lord's day, then it is incurred already, for there are several legislative acts, as we have already remarked, which show this respect. But the conclusion is not legitimate, for surely to endow religion, and to respect it, or more properly to refuse to profane it, are not the same.

"Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion for enforcing religious observances." Do the petitioners use any other weapon than persuasion? Do they ask Congress to use any other? Do they ask Congress to compel any one to observe the Lord's day? They do ask that Congress would, so far as their agents are concerned, set the example of observing the Lord's day, at least so far as not to profane it in a particular way. They ask for the most powerful persuasive, the example of the men in authority, or rather they ask that this persuasive, this example, may not be employed against an institution deemed essential to the best welfare of the country.

"The petitioners do not complain of any infringement upon their rights." But they do complain that the example of their rulers is directed against a sacred and valuable institution; that a large portion of their fellow citizens are encouraged and invited to profane the Lord's day, and that another portion very considerable, are powerfully tempted, in fact bribed to forget the claims of their Maker, and to direct their whole time to the pursuits of a vain perishing world.

Our remarks have been extended much more than we could have wished, but the Report rendered them necessary. The whole of this subject may be stated in a few words.

The people of the U. States are a religious people. It was under the influence of religion that many of their ancestors settled this country. From the beginning, the Lord's day has been revered not only by individuals, but by the government. Congress have begun to depart from this reverence in a remarkable manner, by the proceedings in the Post Office department, which, if they did not order, they permit; and refuse, though repeatedly applied to, to restrain. Millions, in consequence of their connexion with the Post Office operations, now profane the Lord's day. This is an evil in itself. The example is bad. Who can say that after one or two generations, the Lord's day may not be almost universally disregarded? We ask Congress to interpose, reminding them that religion is essential to civil government, and that separated from the Sabbatical observance, religion will not exist. We appeal to the example of their predecessors, under whose sway the country flourished so much, for there was a time when the Mail did not travel on Sunday. We remind them of their professed reverence for the Lord's day, as testified by various acts, and intreat them to be consistent. We ask

them to do this little for the most important of causes, not to profane the Sabbath, not by their example and their pecuniary power to encourage its profanation. Have not Congress a right to give to religion this negative protection? Who can doubt it, for it is a power they have uniformly exercised? Ought they to throw the weight of their influence against religion? Are not the moral interests of the country as valuable as its commercial? Is it asking too much that the former should be countenanced at least so far as to require the Mail-carrier and the Post-Master, in common with the rest of their fellow-citizens to "remember to the Sabbath day," or rather not to work on that day, as many others are prohibited from doing. We think the petition is reasonable, laudable, and ought to be persevered in. At least let us reap the satisfaction of having done all we could to promote its meritorious object.

POETRY.

SABBATH MORN.—*An Extract.*

Dear is the hallow'd morn to me,
When solemn bells awake the day—
And, by their sacred minstrelsy
Call me from earthly cares away.

And dear to me the winged hour,
Spent in thy hallow'd courts, O Lord,
To feel devotion's soothing power,
And catch the manna of thy word.

And dear to me the loud 'Amen,'
Which echoes through the blest abode,
Which swells, and sinks, and swells again,
Dies on the walls, but lives to God.

And dear the simple melody,
Sung with the pomp of rustic art—
That holy, heavenly harmony,
The music of a thankful heart.

In secret I have often pray'd,
And still the anxious tear would fall—
But on thy sacred altar laid,
The fire descends and dries them all.

Oft when the world, with iron bands,
Has bound me in its six-days' chain,
This bursts them, like the strong man's hands,
And lets my spirit loose again.

Then, dear to me Sabbath morn,
The solemn bells, the Shepherd's voice
These oft have found my heart forlorn,
And always bid that heart rejoice.

Go! man of pleasure, strike thy lyre,
Of broken Sabbaths sing the charms—
Our's are the Prophet's car of fire,
Which bears us to a Father's arms.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

General Theological Seminary.—Extract of a letter dated 3d March.—“The General Seminary has twenty-seven students, of whom, however, only twenty-six are in full connexion. The School at Alexandria has in all twenty-one students, of whom only thirteen are divinity students. Bishop Chase, I am told, has only one divinity student, although several are in a course of preparatory study. The students in the General Seminary are boarding for \$1 74 per week, or for a trifle less than \$2, including washing.”

Protestant Episcopal Education Society of Virginia and Maryland.—It is stated in the last report that this Society, instituted in 1818, is believed to have been for several years *the only* Society for this purpose in the Episcopal Church. The writer of the report is mistaken, as “the Society for the advancement of Christianity in South-Carolina,” one of whose special objects is “to take by the hand youths of genius and piety, who need the fostering aid of benevolence, and are meet to be trained for the ministry of the Church, and see that they are properly educated,” was instituted in the year 1810. This Society has had several beneficiaries, and we believe some of them prior to 1818. The Society for the advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania, which is also an Education Society, was instituted in 1812.

Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania.—It appears from the 17th report that this Society employed during the year past, five Missionaries, and expended \$2,166. Of one branch of expenditure it has been relieved by the “*Episcopal Female Tract Society.*” They deserve well of the Church, (says the report) “for the many admirable tracts they have published, all calculated to promote a sound morality and an enlightened faith. Several of the standard tracts have been stereotyped; such as *Sins of the Tongue*, *Little Jane*, and *‘A Christian Temper is every thing.’* By this operation they will be enabled to meet the large demand for their best publications, and furnish them at a very reduced price.

“We cannot too earnestly recommend the claims of this Society to the general patronage of Episcopalians. It has been eminently useful, and is limited in its beneficence only by the inadequate patronage it has received. Every female of our Church, blessed with the ability, ought to be a subscriber to this institution, whose publications, in their respective quotas, are more than an equivalent for the moderate subscription of \$1.”

A Committee, by applying to members of the Church, not already members of the Society, succeeded in adding to its regular income, \$1000 a year, for three years. The following resolution was passed, viz: That the several Parishes be requested to form Parish Domestic Missionary Societies, auxiliary to this Society.—On this subject the Bishops have addressed the following circular:

"To the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Pennsylvania.—Brethren, we cordially recommend to you the formation of Parish Domestic Societies, in accordance with the resolution accompanying this letter.

The circumstances of our growing country plainly indicate the propriety and necessity of Domestic Missions. Our new settlements may, with few exceptions, plead their pecuniary inability to support the institutions of religion; and they look to their more favoured brethren for aid. In these, and in the settlements more advanced, there are brethren of our small and scattered Episcopalian family, who, too few to sustain entirely the burden of such expenses, must receive help; or, if it be denied, they and their offspring will be constrained to become aliens to the worship and the ministration which are dearest to their hearts, and the most approved by their understandings. Nor should we forget, that among the changes constantly occurring in our active and reflecting population, is to be included the not unfrequent change of religious opinions; which, while it deprives us occasionally of members, brings us more than an equivalent in return: and for such as these, especially before they become established in their conformity to the Episcopal Church, it is not only peculiarly expedient, but peculiarly our duty, to provide the services and the counsel of Missionaries.

The commonwealth of Pennsylvania presents a large field for duties of this kind; and we trust that, for a measure calculated so greatly to increase her spiritual prosperity, we shall not appeal to her sons and daughters in vain. We would not have you diminish the bounty you may think fit to bestow on more extended missionary operations: on the contrary, we wish them success, and account them worthy of your contributions. But we deem it an incontrovertible maxim, that the wants of each diocese have the first and chief claim upon its members.

The Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania, was instituted in 1812. One of its chief objects is the support of missionaries. And it is a fundamental rule, that they be under the direction of the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. It has also been recognized and recommended by the diocesan convention. It has employed a number of missionaries, by whose labours many congregations have been collected and established. The number of missionaries now in its service is *nine*, and there is an urgent call for more. Indeed the extension of the borders of the Church in this diocese continually enlarges the sphere of its domestic missionary operations, and calls for a settled and vigorous missionary system.

We add with regret, that the resources of the society named, are too limited for even the present demand for missionary labour.

With such urgent claims on your benevolence, we trust that your exertions, your contributions, and your prayers, will be zealously devoted to this important object.

WILLIAM WHITE,
H. U. ONDERDONK.

Philadelphia, Oct. 13, 1828."

Middle Florida Mission.—It gives us pleasure to mention that the Mission to Tallahassee has been aided in Charleston, to the amount of \$160, of which \$50 has been contributed by the Gregory Society, composed of Ladies, \$50 by the Young Men's Missionary Society, and the balance by individuals.

Mission to the Canada Indians.—"The state of religion (writes an English Clergyman, dated Upper Canada, Nov. 1,) prospers here wonderfully both amongst our Indian people and white settlers. I have a congregation of three hundred Indians (Mohawks) here, another about three miles off, (Oneidas,) and another about twelve miles, (Tuscaroras,) with four schools, and other buildings, for the education of this degraded people; am furnished with abundant means for civilizing them, and directing their minds to the things of God. Amongst the settlers, we have now a people united in the service of God and our Church, though not long since carried about by every passing doctrine that assailed their ears: but now all is unity and concord."

West Indies.—The Barbadoes Society for the conversion of slaves, say in their report—"As a desire on the part of the slaves for instruction on a more extended system than that hitherto pursued by the catechists has been found to evince itself, your committee would gladly notice correspondent exertions for meeting and encouraging those feelings; nor can they conceive a plan less open to objections, than that devised, and now partially in operation, under the guidance of the Lord Bishop of the diocese. Your committee, in the process of this well arranged scheme, hope to see the body of catechists merged into that of Sunday Schoolmasters: and a higher class of readers to plantations on Sundays, acting under the immediate superintendence of the Rectors.

With the intention of affording all possible encouragement to Sunday Schools, your committee have, in many instances, authorized the Treasurer to grant small remunerations, not exceeding £10 currency per annum, to teachers of Sunday Schools—either to the master himself, or to approved scholars from the daily school; and in proportion to the extent of their funds, they will contribute most readily to promote this simple plan of instruction.

The advantages arising therefrom are evident: no time is thus lost to the proprietor or to the slave, and the association of religious knowledge with the Lord's day, and with habits of frequenting the house of God, must be invaluable."

To labour among the Maroons of the free Negro settlers, in Jamaica, Christian teachers have been sent by the united liberality of the Christian Missionary Society, and the Ladies' Society.

India.—Extract of a letter.—"Our late Bishop and Mrs. James were very desirous of aiding and assisting every thing in their power, but they have not been permitted to stay with us. The Bishop left Calcutta last June in order to visit the upper Provinces, and was

not well when he left us, but his illness increased so rapidly that he was obliged to return, and when he reached Calcutta he was too ill to be removed from his boat, but was taken directly to the ship, and is to proceed to Penang, and from thence to China, if he survives, and finally to England.

The Bishop sent in his resignation to Government, but they could not receive it here. They have forwarded it to England. Archdeacon Corrie once more supplies the Bishop's place in a most unexpected, and, to him, unwished for way. His health has been excellent of late."

As regards the Bishop, this is very painful news, and we may perhaps be permitted to exclaim with the Psalmist, "Help Lord, for the godly man ceaseth."

Bible Class, a good example.—The Bible Class at Springfield, (Mass.) was formed about two years since, under favourable auspices, and has not lost any of its interest since its commencement. Its members have much increased. During the first winter, about one hundred and fifty attended with great punctuality; there are now from two to three hundred who assemble regularly every Saturday evening. They attend to the geography, biography, chronology, natural history, doctrines and precepts, contained in the lesson for the evening. They have a correct map of the Holy Land, to which frequent reference is made during the recitations; occasionally a dissertation is read by some of the Class upon some subject contained in the lesson. By this kind of variety the interest of the youth in the subject is not suffered to flag, and they study the Scriptures with great eagerness. After paying for necessary expenses, purchasing a valuable Map of Palestine, they paid into the American Bible Society \$120.

Sewing Societies.—Last spring, articles of the greatest variety, made in the capital cities of Prussia, Saxony, and other parts of Germany, were sold in Baltimore to the amount of more than \$900; all of which were made by the hands of pious females of the first circles of Germany, not even excepting the ladies of the court, and forwarded to America for the benefit of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa.

Scarcity of Books suitable for Sunday School Libraries.—"Among the many hundreds of books published for the use of youth, (remarks the Editor of the *Family Visitor*) and a large proportion of them expressly for Sunday School Libraries, we do not know that *fifty* could be named, of which we would assert that they were entirely such as should form the Library of a Protestant Episcopal Sunday School. Books which, as printed in England, would be well adopted to our use, have been spoiled in their republication in this country. Others, of which the doctrinal tendency is good, are dry and unsuited to the taste and capacity of childhood. Others again, not absolutely erroneous in point of doc-

trine, or preceptive religion, are dangerous on account of their romantic garb. But by far the greatest number contain, scattered throughout a mass of matter generally unexceptionable, doctrines either absolutely repugnant to the standards of our Church, or putting upon those standards an interpretation which a large proportion of her members are unwilling to allow. Now we *do not believe* that a single exceptionable statement of doctrine or opinion respecting ecclesiastical matters, is the less dangerous on account of its isolated situation. Our experience tends to prove that its concealment among a large proportion of correct opinion, invests it with more deleterious effect. The poisonous drug which is concealed in a mass of wholesome aliment, loses none of its efficiency, but obtains on that account the readier access to the vitals. Many a book which a hasty reader, however thoroughly attached to the principles of our Church, might approve, as highly useful, we should feel ourselves called upon to reject, on account of a *very few* passages at variance with what we consider pure and undefiled Gospel verity. In fine, most of the juvenile publications with which the press is daily teeming, are very loosely written. It will not be an easy task to make selections of which we can deliberately say, that they are *not bad*. To compile any considerable list of books *positively good*, s, in our view at least, absolutely impossible."

Under these circumstances it gives us great pleasure to learn that this subject has engaged the attention of some competent members of our Church (viz. the Editors of the *Family Visitor*) and that they are pledged to provide so far as the difficulty of the subject will permit for the lamented deficiency.

Conversion of Jews.—On the 20th June was transmitted to Mr. Peel, for presentation to his Majesty, a most superb copy of the Prayer Book of the Church of England, which that gentleman lost no time in placing in his Majesty's hands. It was accompanied with the following inscriptions:

"To His Most Gracious Majesty King George the Fourth, this Book of Common Prayer is humbly presented as a testimony of their high veneration for the Liturgy of the Church of England, and of their loyalty to their beloved Sovereign, by five Jews, convinced of the truth of Christianity through the instrumentality of William Bridges."

[Then follows a Hebrew and a Greek inscription.]

If, with perfect propriety and good taste, these Jews intimated their conversion, in the first instance, to their sovereign, the next step they took, partaking of a public character, was prompted by Christian benevolence and love. The whole, or part of them had been in the habit, for a considerable time, of attending the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Howells, of the Episcopal Chapel in Long Acre, in connexion with which there is a flourishing Sunday School. To each of the children attending this school, amounting to seventy-eight, they presented a copy of the Book of Common Prayer, with the following inscription written on each book:

"A minute token of Christian love to the tender lambs of Messiah's flock, from five of the seed of Abraham, with the fervent prayer that the Holy Spirit may take and show unto them the things that be of Christ."

Seamen.—The labours of the Prayer Book and Homily Society among Seamen, have of late been considerably extended; many of the sea-ports have been visited; and at several of them agencies, for the most part under the direction of clergymen, have been established, the whole of his majesty's ships in ordinary—stationed at Sheerness, Chatham, Portsmouth, and Devonport, have been supplied, under the sanction and superintendence of the respective commanders, with the formularies of the Church: visits for the same general purpose have been paid to the Hulks; and volumes of select homilies, gratuitously supplied, have been placed under the care of the several chaplains, for the use of the prisoners there confined.

In the prosecution of none of these objects have the committee been without abundant encouragement to proceed in their labours. The reception given to their agent, by persons of piety and zeal, who had felt the need of such exertions as this Society is making, but who were not previously informed of them—the ready co-operation which has been afforded, as well by laymen as clergymen—the good wishes expressed, and the promises of future aid and support given—with other circumstances, directly or collaterally connected with their object, have helped to strengthen the hands of the committee in this important but arduous undertaking.

Among the collateral encouragements, to which allusion has been made, one is so highly interesting, as connected with a name both loved and revered, that it justly claims especial notice.—The captain of an Indiaman, who deeply felt for the condition of seamen, and was most desirous of doing all in his power to promote their comfort and improvement, said—

When my ship was at Bombay, I respectfully solicited the late Bishop Heber, who was then at that presidency, to perform divine service on board my vessel: the good Bishop expressed his willingness, but stated also his fears that the sailors would pay little or no attention to the service. His lordship, however, came on board, and having performed divine service twice that day in the presence of the crew, was so much gratified with the marked attention of the men, that he appointed a chaplain to read prayers and preach every Sunday to the congregated crews of the ships lying at Bombay.

The committee name this fact, as a practical and very striking answer to the objections of those who say or think that sailors are men for whose spiritual welfare very little can be done. The Society's agent does indeed, meet with some individuals among them most pitiably profligate, and most daringly wicked; but few instances have occurred, in which words of mild expostulation and suitable advice have not been blessed to the production of at least some present effect. While, in cases where one has said, that "During a late voyage to India the men were not once called to public

prayers;" another, "I have been twenty-six," and another, "I have been forty years at sea, and never known the crew assembled for prayers during that period;" such expressions as these have been also heard: "It is well to have a Prayer Book, because we can read prayers by ourselves, if there is no public service on board;" and where a captain has been led to remark, "I have made several voyages, but have never known a sailor to ask either for a Bible or Prayer Book when at sea," but at the same time permitted your agent to go among the crew, the men have seemed convinced of the necessity of prayer, and have gladly availed themselves of the Society's liberal offer, and have purchased Prayer Books.

BIBLE QUESTIONS.

1. *What are the reflections naturally suggested by the festival of Easter?*
2. *State the arguments in favour of the general Resurrection.*

Consult Pearson, Secker, or Kettlewell, on the *Eleventh Article of the Apostle's Creed*. Bishop Hobart's *Fourth Sermon*, vol. 2. Bishop Dehon's *Forty-fifth Sermon*. Religious Magazine for January, 1829, page 78.

NEW PUBLICATION.

"Provincial Letters, containing an exposure of the Reasonings and Morals of the Jesuits; by Pascal. Translated from the French. New-York, 1828."

"A circumstance worthy of notice respecting these letters, is the high praise which has been awarded to them at different periods, and by persons of different sentiments and characters. 'The Bishop of Meaux, being asked what work he would covet most to be the author of, supposing his own performances set aside, answered *'the Provincial Letters.'* In the recorded judgment of Voltaire, 'Moliere's best comedies do not excel these letters in wit, nor the compositions of Bossuet in sublimity.' Gibbon is said to have possessed so enthusiastic an admiration for this book, that he was accustomed to read it through once every year. D'Alembert speaking of the Provincial Letters, says, 'This masterpiece of pleasantry and eloquence diverted and moved the indignation of all Europe, at their (the Jesuits) expense.'"

These letters properly divide themselves into two parts: the first ten being occupied in exposing the frivolous distinctions, dishonest arts, and immoral principles and practices of the Jesuits; and the last eight, with the author's defence of himself against the attacks which his previous letters had provoked.

The following promiscuous extracts will show how these self-styled 'Holy Fathers' contrived to release their disciples and followers from the most sacred obligations, not only of religion, but of morality and decency, and to encourage and embolden them in the worst of crimes.

"If a person give a temporal for a spiritual possession, that is, money for a living, and give the money as the price of the benefice, it is a manifest simony; but if it be given as the motive to induce the patron to confer it, it is not simony, though he who confers it have the pecuniary consideration alone in view. By this means we prevent an infinity of simoniacal transactions; for who would be so wicked when he offers his money for a benefice, to do it as the price, and not as the motive, to influence its bestowment? No one surely, can act so criminally." p. 88.

"It is no simony to procure a benefice, by promising money which you really never intended to pay, because it is only a mock simony, which is no more real than a counterfeit guinea is a genuine one." p. 186.

"May servants who complain of their wages, add to them, by swindling from their masters property, as much as they deem necessary to recompense their services? They may do it *sometimes*, as when they are so poor in looking out for a situation, that they have been obliged to accept whatever offer was made them, whilst other servants of the same class, gain more elsewhere." p. 92. "They are allowed to commit theft not only in cases of extreme necessity, but when their afflictions, though heavy, are not extreme." p. 118.

"An incumbent may, without being guilty of a mortal crime, wish for the death of a person who is a pensioner upon his benefice; and a son for that of his father, and rejoice in it whenever it happens, provided that it is only on account of the property that accrues to him, not from any personal hatred." p. 99.

Spirit of the Pilgrim.

Protestant Episcopal Society for the Advancement of Christianity in South-Carolina.

The Librarian reports the following Donations, made the last month:—

By the Rev. C. E. Gadsden.—A Tract on the subjects of, and mode of, administering the Christian Sacrament of Baptism. Fifty copies. 12mo. Stitched.

By the Hon. Thomas S. Grimke.—Apparatus Ad Positiam Theologiam Methodicus, &c. Auctore R. P. Petro Annato. 2 vols. in one, quarto. Venetiis, MDCCCLXVII. The Doctrine of the Two Covenants, &c. by the Right Rev. Dr. Ezekial Hopkins, late Lord Bishop of Londonderry. 8vo. London, 1712.

By James Butler Clough, Esq.—Reports of the Society for Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, etc. from 1823 to 1828, inclusive. 8vo. Stitched. Reports of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, &c. for 1822 and 1823. 8vo. Stitched. A Sermon preached at the visitation of the Right Rev. Father in God, John, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, at Wrexham, July 29, 1822; by Charles Butler Clough, B. S. Rector of Llanferres, Denbighshire, &c. 2d edition. 8vo. 1822. Stitched.

By John W. Sommers, Esq. Planter, of St. Paul's Parish.—Berriman's Sermons. London, 1751. 8vo. Greene's Nine Sermons. London, 1759. 8vo. Newlin's Sermons. Oxford 1728. 8vo. Thirty-nine Articles. With Notes. London, 1750. 8vo. The Treasurer reports the following new subscribers.

John J. Bulow, life member, \$50; Wm. Mason Smith, annual do. \$5; Mrs. Jane Thomas, do. \$5; Miss Ann H. Thomas, do. \$5; Mrs. Eliza C. Godfrey, do. \$5.

EPISCOPAL ACTS.

ORDINATIONS.

By the Right Rev. Dr. Bowen, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina.—On Sunday, March 15, 1829, at Sheldon Church in Prince William's Parish, the Rev. Thomas John Young, Deacon, was admitted to the Holy Order of Priests.

CONSECRATIONS.

By the Right Rev. Dr. Croes, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New-Jersey.—On Friday, February 20, 1829, St. Mark's Church, at Orange, Essex county, was solemnly consecrated to the Christian Worship of Almighty God.

By the Right Rev. Dr. Hobart, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New-York.—On Sunday, January 25, 1829, Christ Church in Oswego; and on Thursday, January 29, 1829, St. Michael's Church, Geneseo; and on Sunday, February 1, 1829, Zion Church, Palmyra, were severally solemnly consecrated to the Christian Worship of Almighty God.

CALENDAR FOR APRIL.

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 3. Monthly Meeting of the Managers of the Female Episcopal Bible, Prayer Book and Tract Society. | |
| 5. Fifth Sunday in Lent. | |
| 6. Monthly Meeting of the Trustees of the Protestant Episcopal Society. | |
| 12. Sixth Sunday in Lent. Palm Sunday. | |
| 13. Monday before Easter. | 18. Easter Even. |
| 14. Tuesday do. do. | 19. Easter Day. |
| 15. Wednesday do. do. | 20. Easter Monday. |
| 16. Thursday do. do. or Holy Thursday. | 21. Easter Tuesday. |
| 17. Good Friday. | 25. St. Mark. |
| 26. First Sunday after Easter. Low Sunday. | |
| 30. Monthly Meeting of the Standing Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society of Young Men and Others. | |